HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.1899 of 2007

Dated:06.02.2007

Between:

J.Appa Swamy.

...Petitioner.

and

The Secretary and others.

...Respondents

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.1899 of 2007

ORDER:

The vehicle of the petitioner, bearing No.KA 34D 7777, was seized by the Motor Vehicle Inspector, Manchirial, Adilabad District, on 10.01.2007, pointing out certain lapses. The petitioner states that he approached the Regional Transport Authority, Manchirial, the 2nd respondent herein, for compounding the lapses and for payment of tax due, and accordingly, an order, dated 18.01.2007, was passed by the 2nd respondent, after collecting the dues of tax penalty etc., and on production of relevant records. It is also his case that on the direction issued by the 2nd respondent, he approached the 1st respondent, his counter signing authority, at Anatapur, for necessary orders and there, a further sum of Rs.8,200/- was collected and despite the same, the vehicle was not released.

Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Transport.

A perusal of the copies of proceedings placed before

this Court, discloses that the petitioner was put to unavoidable hardship. While the office of the 2nd respondent is on the northern end, the office of the 1st respondent is on the southern end of the State, separated almost by 1000 kilometres. If it was imperative for the petitioner to have taken steps at both the offices, the respondents ought to have ensured that a comprehensive order is passed indicating the nature of steps to be taken. Respondents 1 and 2 did not act in tandem and the net result is that the vehicle of the petitioner remained in the custody of the respondents for over 20 days.

Respondents 1 and 2 have appeared before this Court in person and explained the circumstances that led to the delay. It is ultimately stated that the vehicle has since been released.

In that view of the matter, the Writ Petition is closed and it is directed that respondents 1 and 2 shall not permit such things to recur in future. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

Dt.06.02.2007
L.NARASIMHA REDDY, J

GJ

–